1. Introduction

Although the Kwa and Bantu languages are both Niger-Congo, they display very striking differences. Table 1, adapted from Good (2005) citing Westermann & Bryan (1952), gives a snapshot of some outstanding properties of these two language families.

Table 1: Kwa vs. Bantu prototype (Adapted from Good 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kwa</th>
<th>Bantu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Labiovelar ( kp, gb )</td>
<td>Labiovelars not common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Monosyllabic words (CV)</td>
<td>Canonical verb roots: CVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inexistent/residual noun class</td>
<td>Exuberant noun class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rigid word order</td>
<td>Apparent free word order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dative expressed by serial verb with give</td>
<td>Apparent free word order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No agreement</td>
<td>Dative with applicative morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Basic past vs. non-past distinction</td>
<td>Various tense distinctions, and fine-grained past distinctions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The property under 3 appears the most striking for a non-bantuist. Indeed, while Bantu languages display robust noun class systems with intricate properties, only a very few Kwa (e.g. Twi) show some residual noun class system. In the Gungbe (Kwa) sentences under (1a-b), bold typeface indicates that this language has two word initial vowels; \( \text{o}\)- and \( \text{a}\)- that could possibly be leftovers of a very remote noun class system. However, the parentheses in (1a) show that \( \text{o}\)- can be dropped in actual speech, but not \( \text{a}\)- (1a. vs. 1b). In addition, these elements never trigger agreement: two properties atypical of genuine noun classes.

(1) a. (\( \text{o}\))kpá cè nà hó [Gungbe]
    fence 1sg-Poss Fut collapse ‘My fence will collapse’

b. \( \text{á}\)tín cè hó
    tree 1sg-Poss collapse ‘My tree collapsed’

c. Mí dò kpá ná Yètì
    1pl plant fence give Yeti ‘We built a fence for Yeti’

The sentences under (1) further illustrate other Kwa properties listed in table 1. Most words are monosyllabic; there is a simple past versus non-past distinction (1a.vs 1c); there is no agreement of any sort (e.g. subject verb or possessive possessor); and

---

1 The Gungbe (Kwa) data come from my own work, but the Bantu examples are reproduced as in the original sources. In the context of the Kwa versus Bantu comparison presented in this paper, it is important to keep in mind that the characterization of these language families is based on only a few sample languages and further detailed study is needed before we get a more precise picture.
Dative or benefactive is encoded by a serial verb (1c). Finally, the basic word order is rigidly SVO because word order alternation is crucially determined by discourse properties such as topicalization or focusing (see Aboh 2004, chapters 7, 8).

In addition to discourse-related word order variations, these languages display aspectual sensitive VO versus OV alternations. For instance, the VO sequences in (1) are mainly found in non-imperfective sentences. On the other hand, OV (2a-c) is associated with progressive and other aspects, such as inceptive or purpose (see Awoyale 1997, Manfredi 1997, Aboh 2004, chapter 6).

   1pl Prog fence plant give Yeti.Prt
   ‘We are building a fence for Yeti’

b. Mí jè [kpá] dó ná Yéfù jí
   1pl start fence plant give Yeti Prt
   ‘We started building a fence for Yeti’

c. Mí yì [kpá] dó ná Yéfù gbé
   1pl go fence plant give Yeti Prt
   ‘We went in order to build a fence for Yeti’

The additional low tone on Yéfù in (2a), the elements jí in (2b), or gbé in (2c) are indicative of another strong property of the Kwa languages: they often involve grammatical particles (sometimes tones) that serve to encode aspect or discourse specifications.

Things look different in Bantu. As most studies on Bantu show, these languages are clearly more exuberant: the following two points (i.e. expression of deixis, word order) will suffice our demonstration. Table 2, taken from Nkemnji’s (1995) work on Nweh (a grassfield Bantu language), lists the various demonstratives found in this language.

Table 2: Demonstrative pronouns in Nweh (Nkemnji 1995: 31)²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun classes</th>
<th>1/3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7/9/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This/these (near speaker)</td>
<td>g₃wùc</td>
<td>bufùc</td>
<td>lùwc</td>
<td>mùwc</td>
<td>jùwc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That/those (near listener)</td>
<td>g₃wùc</td>
<td>bufùc</td>
<td>lùwc</td>
<td>lùwc</td>
<td>lùwc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That/those (distal)</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>rã</td>
<td>mĩ</td>
<td>zã</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the thirteen forms in table 2, which are marked for various noun classes, Gungbe (Kwa) offers two corresponding forms only. These simply distinguish between proximate and non-proximate.

(3) a. éhè / éhè lé  b. énè / énè lé
   ‘this’ / this PL = ‘these’  ‘that’ / that PL = ‘those’

The gap between the nominal domains of these language families is replicated within the clausal domain. Unlike Kwa languages, which comply with a fixed word order, (certain) Bantu languages display free word order variation. The Chichewa and Sesotho sentences in (4) illustrate this point (see Bresnan & Mchombo 1987, Marten 2005: 2 for Chichewa, and Demuth & Harford 1999: 5, for Sesotho).

² Bantu examples are reproduced as in the original sources.
It appears from this superficial description that Kwa languages tend to minimize morpho-syntactic computation where Bantu maximize everything. Given the discrepancy between the two language families, one may just stop here and build up a hermetic border between these two groups that will ruin any endeavour of comparison.

This paper takes up the challenge of contrasting Kwa and Bantu when it comes to the expression of information structure. The discussion suggests that these languages slice the clause structure in two domains for encoding topic and focus. Under the view that the clause structure includes peripheral domains (above IP and VP) where specific functional positions host topic and focus expressions (e.g. TopP vs. FocP), I propose that Kwa languages use the higher outer functional layer (i.e. above IP), while Bantu seems to mainly resort to the VP-periphery. Therefore, the two language groups conspire to provide us with empirical evidence for the existence of an articulated left periphery (call it an edge) above IP and VP (Rizzi 1997, Belletti 2002).

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 is a basic description of how Kwa and Bantu languages encode information structure in their grammar. It is shown that these languages share significant properties when it comes to the clausal left periphery, but differ strikingly in contexts where a constituent occurring clause-internally encodes information structure (e.g. in situ focus and wh-questions). Building on this discussion, section 3 raises certain implications of the proposed analysis for seemingly diverse empirical facts such as subject versus object asymmetry in focus structures and verb focusing.

2. Information structure and clause structure
This section presents crucial points of comparison between Kwa and Bantu languages when it comes to the expression of topic and focus sentences. I start with Kwa languages.

2.1 Kwa
In most Kwa, topic (i.e. discourse-linked referents on which the speaker provides a comment), and focus (i.e. a constituent conveying non-presupposed information, or expressing a quantificational-like operation, Kiss 1998:1) are realised in the clausal left periphery. In such cases, the focused or topicalized constituents occur in a pre-subject position where they are very often associated with a marker. The Gungbe sentences under (5) illustrate such left peripheral markers for topic (5a) and focus (5b). In addition, topics, unlike focus, involve a resumptive pronoun inside the proposition.
In accounting for these structures, I suggested in previous work that the Kwa languages provide strong empirical evidence for the cartographic approach to the clausal left periphery. In this framework the topic and focus markers head distinct projections within the clausal left periphery as indicated in (6a). Under this representation, topic and focus constructions involve movement of the topic or focus constituent to the specifier of the relevant phrase as depicted in (6b-c).

In order to understand these facts, it is crucial to keep in mind that the markers yà and wè, have no other usage or function in the language than expressing topic and focus, respectively. See Aboh (2003, 2004, 2006a, b) and references cited there for discussion.

With regard to focus proper, we can define two strategies: non-verbal versus verbal focusing. Non-verbal focusing targets any non-verbal category, which must front to the left of the focus marker wè. We find a bare noun in (7a), an (in)definite specific DP in (7b-c), an adverbial phrase in (7d), a locative phrase in (7e), and an adjectival phrase in (7f).
A few remarks are in order here, but the interested reader is referred to Aboh (2003, 2004, 2006a, b), and references cited there for a detailed discussion. As is the case in many African languages, focus constructions in Kwa display a subject versus object asymmetry: Subject focus always requires an ex-situ strategy that forces the occurrence of the focus marker, as indicated by the following question-answer pair.

   ‘Who came?’  ‘Kofi came’

Non-subject focus, however, involves two strategies, in situ (9a) versus ex-situ (9b). These imply two different information structures roughly corresponding to Kiss’ (1998) new information versus identificational focus (see also Aboh, in press).

(9) a. Mènù wè à yrà?  b. Ùn yrà Kòfì
   Who Foc 2sg call lsg call Kofi
   ‘Who did you call?’  ‘I called KOFI [New information focus]’
   c. Kòfì wè àn yrà
     Kofi Foc 2sg call
     ‘I called KOFI [Identificational focus]’

As is clear from the examples in (8) and (9), non-verbal focusing and wh-questions involve the same syntactic process: fronting of the focused or wh-phrase to the left of the focus marker. Crucially, in-situ wh-questions are excluded in these languages, and example (10) can only be interpreted as an echo question.

(10) À yrà mènù?
    2sg call who
    * ‘Who did you call?’
    ‘You called who?’

Finally, non-verbal focusing allows for long distance extraction as indicated by example (11).

(11) a. Ètè wè à sè dà Dòsù kù t[è] wá
    what Foc 2sg hear that Dosu drive come
    ‘What did you hear that Dosu drove to come?’
   b. [Mótò 1s] wè ùn sè dà Dòsù kù t[è] wá
      car Det Foc lsg hear that Dosu drive come
      ‘I heard that Dosu came with THAT CAR [i.e. the aforementioned one]’

The overall generalization is therefore that non-verbal focus constructions (including wh-questions) in Kwa involve fronting of a category to a position left adjacent to the focus marker. The process is not clause-bound and allows long distance extraction.

With regard to verbal focusing, two main strategies are attested in Kwa languages that all involve fronting of the verb (phrase). In Gungbe, for instance, the focused verb is fronted, and relates to an identical doublet IP-internally (12a). The percentage diacritic indicates that certain Gungbe speakers allow the focus marker to follow the fronted verb. In the Ewegbe example (12b) however, the fronted category
is a nominalised reduplicated verb that precedes the focus marker and co-occurs with a non-reduplicated doublet IP-internally.

b. φo-φo é wó φo é RED-beat Foc 3sg beat 3sg ‘BEATING s/he beat him/her’ [Ewegbe (Kwa), Ameka 1992:12]

Overall, the picture that emerges from Kwa languages is that the expression of (contrastive) focus is restricted to the clausal left periphery only. This suggests the schematic representation in (13), where we see that tense, mood, and aspect markers, which typically precede the verb, encode INFL related information. On the other hand, expressions related to information structure must occur to the left periphery and are typically realized by distinct markers.

(13) [ForceP [TopP yà [FocP [Foc wè [FinP [Fin …[TP …[AspP …….[VP…]]]]]]]]]
Complementizer system (Including various discourse markers)
Inflectional domain (Including TMA markers)

With this description in mind, let us now turn to Bantu languages.

2.2 Bantu

The representation in (13) seems to find confirmation in Bantu languages as well. Indeed, several studies on Bantu show that these languages involve fronting operations, where a focused or topicalized constituent occurs in sentence-initial position. Zulu examples, taken from Zeller (2004) illustrate such constructions and further show that the dislocated element may be either resumed by a clitic pronoun (14a) or a full pronoun (14b) inside the proposition.

b. Le ndoda ngi-thand-a yona 9Dem 9man 1sg-like-FV 9Abs ‘This man, I like (him)’

Building on the description of Kwa, as well as previous work on left dislocation cross-linguistically (Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997), I regard these Bantu constructions as topics where the topicalized element is resumed IP-internally by a pronoun, or clitic-like morpheme (Bresnan and Mchombo 1987). In this regard, example (15) further shows that these topics are not root phenomena or hanging topics in the sense of Cinque (1990) because they can occur in embedded clauses where they follow the complementizer as indicated in (15a). The Gungbe example in (15b) indicates a complete parallel between Bantu and Kwa in this respect.
(15) a. UThemba u-cabang-a **ukuthi** incwadi umfana kumele
1aThemba 1SM-think-FV that 9book 1boy must
a-yi-fund-e
1SM-9OC-read-FV
‘Themba thinks that the book, the boy must read’ [Zeller 2004: 8]
b. Ùn nywèn dò [kèkè lò lè], yà Dòsù ná sà-yè
1sg know that bicycle Det PI Top Dosu Fut sell-3pl
‘I know that as for the bicycles, Dosu will sell them’

Under Cinque (1990) and much related work, the need for resumption in left dislocation structures results from their status as non-quantificational constructions. Therefore, the dislocated element cannot license a variable IP-internally. As extensively discussed in the literature, many languages circumvent this situation by allowing a properly licensed pronominal element to occur in the extraction site of the dislocated topic. Under this description, the object clitic in (14a, 15a) and the full pronoun in (14b) in Zulu as well as the Gungbe weak pronoun in (15b) represent language-specific devices for enabling the topic construction to converge (see Aboh 2004: 302 and references cited there).

In terms of this analysis therefore, topic constructions differ from focus constructions because the latter are quantificational and may tolerate an IP-internal variable bound by the focused constituent. While the Gungbe focused constructions discussed thus far support this view, supporting evidence in Bantu comes from Downing (2006: 7) who shows that leftward focus does not involve resumption in Chitumbuka. This is illustrated by example (16a) where the sentence-initial focus constituent is an answer to the question ‘what did they give to the children?’ while in (16b) the focused constituent *maize* is being contrasted to some other crop.

books they-tns-give children
‘They gave the children BOOKS’
b. Ngóoma ti-zamu-limilira namachéero
maize we-Fut-weed tomorrow
‘We will weed MAIZE tomorrow’

Such leftward focused constituents which bind an empty category IP-internally are also found in certain Grassfield Bantu. Such examples are found in Tuki and Nweh, where the focused constituent immediately precedes a focus marker. With these Grassfield Bantu languages, we reach a complete parallel between Kwa and Bantu. Compare the following examples to the Gungbe ones discussed previously.

(17) a. Abongo **odzu** a-ma-kos-en-a agee waa yendze idzo
Abongo Foc SM-P2-buy-Appl-Fv wife his house yesterday
‘It is ABONGO who bought his wife a house yesterday’
[Tuki, Biloa 1997: 51]
b. Njikem mò a kë?). nčúu akendëη
Njikem Foc Agr PI boil plantains
‘NJIKEM boiled plantains’
[Nweh, Nkemnji 1995: 136]

Similarly to Kwa (e.g. Gungbe), these Bantu languages also allow ex-situ wh-phrases
that are parallel to focused expressions. For instance, the Tuki wh-phrases in (18) immediately precede the focus marker.

(18) a. Ane odzu Puta a-nu-banam? [Tuki, Biloa 1997: 53]
    who Foc Puta SM-F1-marry
    ‘Who will Puta marry?’

b. Owate owu Puta a-m(a)-iba-moni?
    why Foc Puta SM-P2-steal-money
    ‘Why did Puta steal the money?’

Put together, these facts indicate that both Bantu and Kwa make use of the clausal left periphery for the purpose of leftward topic and focus. In addition, cross-linguistic studies have shown that topic-marked constituents generally precede focus-marked phrases (Rizzi 1997, Aboh 2004). I therefore conclude from the observed parallels in Kwa and Bantu languages that leftward topicalization and focusing in these languages realizes the underlying structure in (19).

(19) \[
\text{[Force}_P \ldots \text{[Force} \ldots \text{[Top}_P \ldots \text{[Top} \ldots \text{[Foc}_P \ldots \text{[Foc} \ldots \text{[Fin}_P \ldots \text{[Fin} \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{[VP, \ldots]]]]]]]]]\\]
\]

This structure implies that both Kwa and Bantu comply with the cartographic description of clausal left periphery. As already suggested in the literature (e.g., Nkemnji 1995, Biloa 1997, Aboh 2004, Zeller 2004), I conclude that the Bantu left peripheral topic constructions in (14), the focus constructions in (16), as well as the wh-questions in (18) involve the derivations in (20a), (20b) and (20c), respectively.

(20) a. \ldots \text{[Top}_P \text{le ndoda}, \text{[Top}^* \text{[Foc}_P \text{[Foc}^* \text{[Fin}_P \text{ngi-thand yona}, \text{[Fin}^* \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{[VP, \ldots]]]]]]]] = Zulu

b. \ldots \text{[Foc}_P \text{Ma-búuku}, \text{[Foc}^* \text{[Fin}_P \text{βa-ka-pása t}_\text{ma-búuku βáana}], \text{[Fin}^* \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{[VP, \ldots]]]]]]] = Chitumbuka

c. \ldots \text{[Foc}_P \text{Ane}, \text{[Foc}^* \text{odzu}, \text{[Fin}_P \text{[Puta a-nu-banam t}_\text{ane}], \text{[Fin}^* \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{[VP, \ldots]]]]]] = Tuki

Under representation (20) therefore, Bantu and Kwa languages appear very similar in terms of how they encode topic and focus to the left periphery of the clause. Given the differences sketched in table 1, however, it is not surprising that Kwa and Bantu differ sharply in the range of options at their disposal to encode information structure.

2.3 Major differences between Bantu and Kwa

A word of caution is needed before we move on to the characterisation of the relevant facts. The description provided here is relatively basic and represents an incomplete sketch of existing published work on Bantu. It is of no doubt to my mind that more formal study of information structure and its interaction with grammar is needed before we reach any deep understanding of variations between Kwa and Bantu.

This said, an obvious property of Bantu languages that is not found in Kwa, is that the former allow ‘free’ word order (4), while the latter generally maintain rigid SVO order. It is not always clear from the literature whether the varying word orders observed in Bantu are free variants or require different discourse settings. For the sake of the present discussion, I tentatively assume that the sequences illustrated in (4) are not semantically identical and do not require the same discourse specifications.

The existence of these word orders in Bantu seem to correlate with the fact that Bantu languages also display in-situ wh-questions, which are not found in Kwa. Observe the contrast between the Bantu examples in (21) and the Kwa ones in (22).
Together with the data discussed in section 2.2., we reach the conclusion that most Bantu exhibit ex-situ and in-situ wh-questions, while Kwa display ex-situ wh-questions only. In other words, while topics and more crucially focus constituents are forced to front to the left periphery in Kwa languages, Bantu languages seem to allow for two domains where such elements can occur: leftward (i.e. within the clausal left periphery, as in Kwa) or rightward (i.e. within the vicinity of the verb, unlike Kwa).

Close inspection of the latter option reveals that what might look superficially like a classical case of in-situ focus or wh-question hides a more systematic pattern: The focused category or wh-phrase must occur in a derived position immediately after the verb. A case in point is Aghem. In this language, focused constituents and wh-phrases must occur in a position right adjacent to the verb. The position is not case-related and can host any focused category or wh-phrase. To see this, let us first consider the linear order of constituents in Aghem as described in (23a-b) (Watters 1979, Hyman and Watters 1984, Hyman 1979, 2005).

Compared to the neutral sentence (23a), example (24a) shows that a contrastively focused DP object must follow the verb. In this example, the focused object is right adjacent to the verb, while the subject occurs in the canonical position (i.e. preverbally). Further note that the locative adjunct, which follows the object as in (23a), is now displaced to a pre-verbal position. This is indicated by the sequence án ‘sóm ‘in the farm’ in (24a). This process forces the object to occur last in the sentence. At this stage, the Bantu facts recall scrambling phenomena in Germanic, where elements that normally appear within the VP scramble out of this domain in order for focus assignment to fall on the object (Manfredi 1997, Drubig 2003).

Sentence (24b) involving a focused subject shows that, in this case, the subject immediately follows the verb and precedes both the theme and the locative PP. This indicates that the focus position is not sentence-final. On the other hand, the canonical subject position includes an expletive. In a similar vein, focus constructions in (24c-d) show that the focused adjunct (or PP) immediately follows the verb. In both of these cases the focused adjunct occurs in a different position than the position it occupies in neutral sentences (e.g. 23b).
Aghem wh-phrases occur in the same focus position immediately after the verb (Hyman 2005). The sentence in (25a) illustrates an adjunct wh-phrase, while the example under (25b) represents a subject wh-phrase.

Unlike some other Bantu (e.g. Tuki), both ex-situ wh-questions at the clausal left periphery and in-situ wh-questions are impossible in Aghem. As a consequence, the sentences under (26) are ungrammatical because the wh-phrase has been fronted to the left periphery in (26a), while in (26b) the wh-phrase remains in-situ, that is, in its first merge position.

The Aghem data therefore lead to the conclusion that there is a fixed position immediately after the verb that serves to unambiguously mark focus. This conclusion is further supported by the following contrast between Tuki and Aghem. Both languages allow multiple wh-questions. Yet, Tuki and Aghem differ in an interesting way: In Tuki multiple wh-questions, one wh-phrase occurs in the clausal left periphery, while other wh-phrases remain in-situ (27).
Aghem, however, appears to be the opposite of Tuki. In this language, one wh-phrase occurs in the immediately post-verbal position, while others remain in-situ as in (28).

(28) À mò zì ndīghó kwòkò zín? [Aghem, Hyman 2005: 1]

Expl Past eat who what when
‘Who ate what when?’

Finally, Hyman (2005) reports that Aghem also has a focus marker nó that realises the post-verbal focus position and scopes over the element immediately to its left. In (29a), nó scopes over the verb, while in (29b) it takes scope over the object.

(29) a. Tì-bvú ū-bīghà mò zì nó bē-kó
    dogs two Past eat Foc fufu
    ‘The two dogs ATE fufu’ [Hyman 2005: 1]

b. Zì bē-kó nó
    eat fufu Foc
    ‘eat FUFU’

These facts strongly indicate that the postverbal focus position is unique and has clear syntactic and discourse-related properties.

Though not all Bantu languages show similar patterns with Aghem, a piece of evidence that these languages use an immediately post-verbal position for marking focus comes from locative inversion which appears to be robust in Bantu (but non-existent in Kwa). The sentences in (30) show this construction in Chichewa and Sesotho.

(30) a. Ku mu-dzi ku-li chi-tsîme
    17 3-village 17.Subj-be 7-well
    ‘In the village is a well’
    [Chichewa, Bresnan 1994: 77]

b. Maseru basadi ba-ile kajeno
    Maseru 2women 2Agr-go-Perf today
    ‘To Maseru the women went today’
    [Sesotho, Demuth & Harford 1999: 9]

In accounting for locative inversion in Chichewa, Bresnan (1994: 85) concludes that the use of locative inversion in this language has “a special discourse function of presentational focus […] in which the referent of the inverted subject is introduced or re-introduced on the (part of) scene referred to by the preposed locative.” Again, these facts reinforce the observation already made here (and in the literature) that at least some Bantu languages exhibit a non-case related position immediately right adjacent to the verb. This position has the following syntactic and discourse-related properties: (i) licensing this position repulses other arguments to the peripheries of the VP, (ii) the element occupying this position is necessarily a focused constituent (but see Buell 2005, 2006, 2007 for a critical discussion of the focus interpretation of this position in Zulu). Given these two properties and recent studies on the interaction between information structure and clause structure, the question obviously arises what is the structural location of this position (see Aboh, Hartmann & Zimmermann, in press., for some discussion).
2.4 On the possible existence of a ‘low’ focus phrase in Bantu

When we look at the Bantu data (especially those of Aghem) with a Kwa mind, a contrast emerges: While both Bantu and Kwa use the clausal left periphery to express (contrastive) focus and wh-questions (e.g. Gungbe, Tuki), certain Bantu languages exclusively use the postverbal position for the same purpose (Aghem). If, however, one is right in postulating a focus projection within the clausal left periphery for Kwa (Aboh 2004), the question naturally arises whether such a position could exist within the vicinity of the verb phrase in Bantu.

Data from Romance (e.g. Italian, French) may be of some relevance in answering this question. It is a well-known fact that Romance and Bantu share striking properties that call for a principled explanation. One such property is subject (and locative) inversion as illustrated previously for Bantu. Consider, for instance, the French equivalent of the Chichewa sentence (30a).

(31) Dans le village se trouve un puis
    In the village pro find a well
    ‘In the village is a well’

Similarly, Belletti (1998, 2002, 2005) discusses Italian question-answer pairs as in (32) and shows that, even though a felicitous answer may display SV and VS order, the latter is by far the more ‘natural’ and accepted order, hence the bracketed star in (32a).

(32) Chi ha parlato?
    Who has spoken
    a. (*)Gianni ha parlato
        Gianni has spoken
    b. ha parlato Gianni
        has spoken Gianni

Of relevance to our discussion is the fact that in Romance (as in Bantu) the postverbal subject is focused. In Italian, for instance, Cornish (2001: 113) reports that the type of focus obtained in such constructions may vary depending on the verb: unaccusative verbs allow for wide or narrow focus, while transitive verbs trigger narrow focus.

If we put the Kwa, Bantu, and Romance facts discussed thus far in perspective, we reach the description in (33) for the distribution of structural focus positions across these languages. By analogy to Gungbe or Tuki, I propose that Aghem nó plays a similar function as the Tuki or Gungbe focus markers, but occupies a focus head position in the VP-periphery.

(33) Gungbe
    [XP + wèr [Focus marker] ....[Subject...V.........]]

Tuki
    [XP +odzu [Focus marker] ....[Subject...V.........]]

Aghem/Italian/Other Bantu
    [.........................V-Subject[Focus] .........]

Aghem/Other Bantu
    [...[subject.............V-XP[Focus] ......... ....]]

Aghem
    [...[subject.............V-(XP)+nô [Focus marker].....]]

Though apparently diverse, the sequences in (33) reduce to a single basic sequencing as in (34), which indicates a focus position (sometimes associated with a marker) to the left of the canonical subject and a focus position (also possibly associated with a marker) to the right of the verb.

(34) [Focus marker] ....[Subject...V.........][Focus marker]....[V-XP[Focus] ......... ....]
In accounting for a similar distribution in Italian, Belletti (2002) proposes that there is within the VP periphery a focus functional projection whose specifier hosts the focused subject. Adopting Kiss’s (1998) distinction in terms of identificational (or exhaustive) versus (new) information focus, Belletti further suggests that the low focus position within the VP periphery is specialized in the expression of new information focus, while the left peripheral position typically encodes identificational focus. This view is not uncontroversial and I will not dwell on it in this paper (see Aboh, in press, for discussion).

Instead, looking at the discussed data from a purely structural perspective, I adopt Belletti’s (2002) analysis, whereby the sequencing in (34) translates into the clause structure in (35) for Bantu (see also Nkemnji 1995). This structure implies that there is a topic/focus articulation both at the clausal left periphery and at the VP-periphery. The IP-internal topic position presumably serves for scrambled material out of the VP (24), while the focus position hosts focused constituents (including the postverbal subject). Keeping the parallel with Kwa, I tentatively assume that Aghem focus marker nó lexicalises the focus head.

(34)  
...Topic…Focus…Subject…verb…Focus…

Given that the topic and focus articulation dominates the VP in this framework, I am led to conclude that, in Aghem and other Bantu, post-verbal focusing derives from movement of the verb to a higher position than that occupied by the focused constituent or wh-phrase, itself in a derived position. There are both empirical and theoretical reasons to conclude that the focus position is a derived one (i.e. outside the VP). First, the position is blind to the categorical status of elements attracted there, the only condition being that they must be focused. Therefore this position is not related to case. Second, though the position is descriptively referred to as immediately after verb position in the Bantu literature, it is not the sister of V. Indeed, if we adopt the traditional VP-internal subject hypothesis it must be the case that, in VS[focus] sequences, the verb has raised past the subject. However, this focused subject cannot be in the first merge position (i.e. VP-internal) given that the position hosts various focused constituents. Therefore, I conclude that in VS[focus] sequences, both the subject and the verb must have moved outside the VP to derived positions. The subject moves to the focus position while the verb moves to some higher functional head.

With regard to the motivations for verb movement in Bantu, I build on previous work on aspect licensing in the Kwa languages (Aboh 2004) as well as recent work on tense and aspect licensing in Bantu (see Nkemnji 1995 and Sabel & Zeller 2002 for some discussion on verb movement in Nweh and Zulu). I therefore propose that verb movement past the focus position is motivated by the need of the verb to raise to an aspect position (i.e. Asp) to be licensed. As a result of this movement, the verb necessarily precedes constituents or wh-phrases that move to the VP-peripheral position. This is illustrated by (36a-b) as partial representations for (24a) and (25a) respectively. Following the antisymmetry framework, I assume that adjuncts are introduced as specifiers (Kayne 1994).
Given that the verb moves across the focus marker nó, one may wonder why there is no violation of the Minimal Link Condition (MLC). Various technical solutions come to mind here (e.g. scattered deletion under Nunes 2004). However, in terms of current minimalist assumptions (Collins 2002, Chomsky 2005), one option that I would like to propose is to propose that the focus head Foc does not have any verbal or tense/aspect features that can value the uninterpretable tense/aspect features on the lexical verb. As such Foc does not represent an appropriate landing site for the verb that is attracted by the aspect head, and it does not count as a proper intervener.

Granting that this is the right characterisation, we can conclude that Aghem and similar Bantu languages provide us with the necessary empirical evidence that what languages of the Kwa-type express in the clausal left periphery, can be realised within the VP-periphery in other languages. Under the comparative approach to Kwa and Bantu adopted here, we reach the description in table 3.

Table 3: Information structure and word order in Kwa and Bantu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression strategies</th>
<th>Kwa</th>
<th>Bantu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic XP to the left (Left dislocation)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus XP to the left</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus particle to the left</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question XP to the left</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus XP in pre/post-V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus particle in pre/post-V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-question in situ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-question in pre/post-V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic XP to the right (Right dislocation)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 (+) = commonly found within the language family,  
 (-) = not commonly found within the language family,  
 (?) = inconclusive facts at the moment of writing.  

3 In relation to this latter point, data discussed for Tumbuka and Tharaka may change the present state of affairs as to the settings of Bantu.
Taken seriously, this table suggests that the parametric variation between Kwa and Bantu, as well as typologically different languages, reduces to whether a language resorts to the clausal periphery and/or the VP periphery for the expression of information structure. Pending new findings (see e.g. discussions on Tumbuka and Tharaka), the variation may simply boil down to whether the discussed languages encode information structure within the VP periphery or not, since both Kwa and Bantu seem to have access to the clausal left periphery.

2.5 Is there an alternative to a low Focus Phrase in Bantu?
While the cartographic view I have adopted here is explored in various languages with some very interesting results (e.g. Nkemnji 1995, Biloa 1997, Rizzi 1997, Cinque 1999, Aboh 2004, Green 2007), the hypothesis that syntax may embed functional projections (e.g. topic, focus) that encode information structure is not uncontroversial (e.g. Zubizaretta 1998). With regard to the proposal I put forward here for Bantu, a point of debate is the existence of a focus projection within the VP periphery that hosts post-verbal focused constituents.

Shortly after the presentation which led to this paper (i.e. Aboh 2006c), Hyman and Polinsky (2006) addressed this issue and concluded that the proposal in (36) should be rejected for an alternative that does away with the low focus position. Space limitations prevent me from discussing their proposal in any detail here. However, the paper involves a number of misrepresentations of my ideas as well as inconclusive suggestions that need to be made clear.

In their discussion of the proposal made in (35) and (36), Hyman and Polinsky (2006: 16) report that “Aboh follows Belletti (2002) in assuming that the vP periphery includes a focus phrase” as in (37) = their example (28).

(37) \( \text{vP} \prec \text{FocusP} \prec (\text{TopicP}) \prec \text{VP} \)

As the cautious reader would have noticed, (37) does not match the structure argued for in (35) and (36) where the topic and focus articulation projects at the edge and therefore dominates vP. More precisely, (37) should be as in (38).

(38) \( \text{AspP} \prec \text{FocusP} \prec (\text{TopicP}) \prec \text{vP} \prec \text{VP} \)

Obviously, this is not a trivial point of detail because it has consequences on the derivations I proposed for Aghem and Bantu, which in turn differ from the ones argued against in Hyman and Polinsky (2006). Take, for instance, their examples (30) and (31) (on page (17)), which were claimed to be problematic for the low focus hypothesis. As clearly shown by (36), verb movement to Asp in combination with object movement to [spec FocP] derive the so-called immediately post-verbal position. On the other hand, the object must scramble out when the verb (phrase) is being focused. In this case verb focus is achieved either by verb adjunction to Foc realised by \( n\) or, along the lines of Nkemnji (1995), by remnant VP-movement to [spec FocP]. Deciding between these competing analyses goes beyond this paper, but the crucial point for the present discussion is that no additional stipulation is needed in the context of (36) to account for V-O_{[Focus]} versus O-V_{[Focus]} sequences in Aghem.\footnote{A crucial point that was overlooked by Hyman and Polinsky (2006) is that representation (36) and its associated derivations are couched within Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetry syntax which excludes right-adjunction. Hyman and Polinsky (2006) instead assume free right-adjunction. This non-trivial difference suggests that evaluating these two approaches in a constructive manner requires a much more robust comparison which I do not attempt here.}
Similarly Hyman and Polinsky (2006: 16) state that: “Aboh makes the following assumptions for Aghem: the verb invariably moves to T, and the focus projection follows”. Here again, the reader would have noticed that the specific claim I make for Aghem is that the verb moves to Asp for aspect licensing. Accordingly, the argument that the verb does not move to T in Aghem is irrelevant to the proposal made here. Nevertheless, one can still wonder whether the ‘short verb movement’ (i.e. V-to-Asp movement) proposed here holds for Aghem. In this regard, I simply quote Hyman and Polinsky (2006: 8) who claimed: “we hypothesize that the verb raises to the head of a higher light verb phrase. This vP is possibly aspectual, which would account for the episodic interpretation found in presentational contexts”. Following this view, the authors further propose that inversion constructions such as (39a) should be assigned the partial representation in (39b).

(39) a. Á mò ñìñ ti-bvù à†zō
   there P2 run dogs yesterday
   ‘There ran dogs yesterday/The dogs RAN yesterday’

   b. [TP à [T mô [Asp ñìñ [vP ti-bvù [v ñìñ [VP [v ñìñ]]]]]]

If we leave aside the topic and focus articulation that I have adopted in this paper, it appears that the representation in (39b) uses the same ingredients as those in (35) and (36) and also assumes ‘short verb movement’ out of the VP to a higher aspect position, where it is licensed. Therefore, both this paper and Hyman and Polinsky make use of verb movement to Asp.

Finally, the authors report: “the focus-projection hypothesis assumes that nó is a phrasal head that takes the focussed constituent as its complement”. Here again, a correction is needed. Under the structure in (35) and (36), the focus head takes the focused phrase as its specifier not its complement. Given this, some of the tone alternations observed in Aghem and discussed in detail in Hyman and Polinsky could well be reformulated in terms of spec-head configuration or agreement, but I leave this for future work.

Another proposal that has been formulated recently as an alternative to the view adopted in this paper comes from Good (2006), who adopted a field-based analysis for postverbal focus in Naki (another grassfield Bantu language). It seems to me fair to say that Good’s (2006) theoretical premises and the ones underlying the cartography approach are too diverse to enable any direct critical evaluation that does justice to both frameworks. Accordingly, I cannot engage into any systematic evaluation of the field-based approach here. Consider, however, the following sequencing adopted by Good (2006: 17) as representative of the clause sequencing of Naki. Here a topic field precedes the predicate which in turn precedes a focus field.

(40) [ ] Topic Field [ ] Predicate [ ] Focus Field

If we consider this sequencing in the context of the discussion in previous sections, it turns out that (40) is nothing but a sub-type of the sequencing in (34). Therefore it seems to me that the only difference between the cartography approach and

detailed and careful comparison than suggested by their paper.

5 These examples correspond to Hyman and Polinsky’s (2006) examples (13a) and (15), respectively.
something like (40) is that the former clearly asks the question of what the structural
make-up of the identified fields is.

It appears from this discussion that the question of whether there is a structural
low focus projection in Bantu remains a matter of enquiry and the jury is still out
there deliberating. In what follows, I show that the analysis adopted here and
illustrated in table (3) has a number of interesting implications for comparative syntax
that are worth investigating carefully.

3. Some implications
The hypothesis that the clause structure embeds a low focus projection that realises
the VP-periphery sheds some light on subject versus object asymmetry in wh-
questions as well as the position of the focused verb across Kwa and Bantu.

3.1 Subject versus object asymmetry
I showed in section 2 that both Kwa and Bantu languages make use of the clausal left
periphery for encoding focus. In this regard, it appeared that Kwa languages exhibit
subject versus object asymmetry in wh-questions, as illustrated previously by examples (8) and (9). Consider again the object wh-question in Gungbe (41a). As
indicated by the felicitous answers in (41b-c), the target of such questions, that is, the
phrase representing new information may occur in-situ (41b) or ex-situ (41c). In the
latter case, the dislocated constituent tends to encode (among other things) contrastive
or corrective focus.

(41) a. Étë wè Kòfï ḏù? b. Kòfï ḏù lësï
    what Foc Kofi eat Kofi eat rice
    ‘What did Kofi eat?’ ‘Kofi ate RICE’

c. Lësï wè Kòfï ḏù
    rice Foc Kofi eat
    ‘Kofi ate RICE’

[Gungbe]

In the subject wh-question-answer pairs under (42), however, the target must front to
the focus position and therefore occurs ex-situ (42c). A reply that contains a subject
in-situ is ungrammatical (42b). Accordingly, the target of the subject wh_phrase is
restricted to the clause Peripheral focus position only, where it occurs to the left of the
focus marker wè. This is illustrated by the contrast in (42b) and (42c).

(42) a. Mënù wè ḏù lësï?
    what Foc eat rice
    ‘Who ate rice?’

b. *Kòfï ḏù lësï
    Kofi eat rice
    ‘KOFI ate rice’

c. Kòfï wè ḏù lësï
    Kofi eat rice
    ‘KOFI ate rice’

The question that we need to answer now is what allows in-situ and ex-situ strategies
in the felicitous answers to object wh-questions, but forces the ex-situ strategy only
for subject wh-questions.

Following the previous discussion, let us assume that the new information
object focus in (41b) realises the low focus position, that is, [spec FocP]. If this is true,
then we have a structural explanation for the ungrammatical example (42b)
involving the subject. Here, the subject is too high in the structure to exploit the low focus position. In accounting for this, Aboh (in press) proposes that the impossibility of the Gungbe subject wh-phrase to exploit the VP-peripheral position in question-answer pairs could be explained if we adopt the hypothesis that the subject must move to [spec TP] to check the EPP-feature under T (Chomsky 1995). Similarly, a focused constituent must move to the focus position [spec FocP]. Following Rizzi (1997) and Rizzi & Shlonsky (2006), let us assume that both [spec FocP] and [spec TP] are criterial positions. According to these authors, such positions are also freezing positions because the satisfaction of the focus or EPP criterion terminates the chain. The attracted element therefore becomes inactive and freezes in place. Given this, there appears to be a competition between the EPP feature and the focus feature when the subject is focused. Indeed, the movement of the subject to the low [spec FocP] will freeze the subject in place. Consequently the derivation will crash because the subject cannot check nominative case, nor can it check the EPP-feature under T. Similarly, movement to [spec TP] for case and EPP, by passing the low focus position, freezes the subject in place. Consequently, the subject will not be able to check its focus feature. Accordingly, the only option available for subject focusing in this language will be for the subject constituent to move obligatorily to the clause peripheral focus position, from where it controls (under c-command), an empty category (e.g. pro) in [spec TP]. This empty category checks EPP under T (43). I further assume that nominative case is checked under Agree (Chomsky 2005).

\[\text{(43)}\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \left[\text{FocP } \text{Mènù} \left[\text{Foc wè \ldots \text{TP } \text{pro} \text{Mènù} \left[\text{AspP } \left[\text{FocP } \left[\text{Foc } \left[\text{VP } \text{tMènù} \text{dà } \text{lèsi}\right]\right] \right] \right] \right]\right];
&\text{b. } \left[\text{FocP } \text{Kòffì} \left[\text{Foc wè \ldots \text{TP } \text{pro} \text{Kòffì} \left[\text{AspP } \left[\text{FocP } \left[\text{Foc } \left[\text{VP } \text{tKòffì} \text{dà } \text{lèsi}\right]\right] \right] \right] \right]\right];
\end{align*}
\]

I claim that obligatory control in such cases is due to the paucity of agreement morphology as well as the lack of DP-expletives in Gbe.

Interestingly, objects do not fall within the realm of this competition precisely because they are not subject to the EPP. Therefore no tension between the EPP and the focus feature arises, and objects can exploit both the low and high focus positions in question-answer pairs. As it appears, languages tend to assign different interpretations (i.e. new versus identificational focus) to these positions, though this might be an artefact rather than a genuine structural distinction (see Aboh, in press). The described strategies are represented in (44b-c) as answer to (44a).

\[\text{(44)}\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \left[\text{FocP } \text{Mènù} \left[\text{Foc wè \ldots \text{TP } \text{pro} \text{Mènù} \left[\text{AspP } \left[\text{FocP } \left[\text{Foc } \left[\text{VP } \text{tMènù} \text{dà } \text{tMènù}\right]\right] \right] \right] \right]\right];
&\text{b. } \left[\text{FocP } \left[\text{Foc } \ldots \text{TP } \text{pro} \text{Kòffì} \left[\text{AspP } \left[\text{Asp } \text{dà } \text{\ldots } \text{AspP } \left[\text{FocP } \left[\text{Foc } \left[\text{VP } \text{tKòffì} \text{dà } \text{tMàrì}\right]\right] \right] \right] \right]\right];
&\text{c. } \left[\text{FocP } \text{Màrì} \left[\text{Foc wè \ldots \text{TP } \text{pro} \text{Màrì} \left[\text{AspP } \left[\text{FocP } \left[\text{Foc } \left[\text{VP } \text{tKòffì} \text{dà } \text{tMàrì}\right]\right] \right] \right] \right]\right];
\end{align*}
\]

What this analysis predicts is that in languages with an expletive, the competition between the EPP/nominative case and the focus feature should be resolved because the subject can check its focus feature in the low focus position, while an expletive will merge in [spec TP] to check the EPP. Again here, nominative case will be checked under Agree.

Interestingly enough, this description coincides exactly with Bantu. In some of these languages that exclusively or mainly exploit the low focus position (e.g. Aghem), the subject checks the focus feature under the low focus head, while an expletive is inserted in [spec TP] that checks the EPP under T. The situation is described again in (45a-b).
(45) a. ˘m˘z˘ nd˘gh˘b˘-k˘?
    Expl Past eat who fufu
    ‘Who ate fufu?’

b. .....[TP ˘[AspP [Asp m˘ [Asp z˘ [FocP nd˘gh˘ [Foc [VP tnd˘gh˘
    t˘z˘ b˘-k˘ ][)[[]]]]]]

In other Bantu languages, the situation is slightly different but points to the same
facts. Sabel & Zeller (2002) observed an interesting contrast in Zulu that confirms the
analysis proposed here. Zulu has both in-situ and ex-situ object wh-questions. Ex-situ
wh-questions are realised as clefts. (46) provides examples for the object from Zulu

    2sg-see-what9     Cop-what9 Rc2sg-0c9-see-Rs
    ‘What did you see?’   ‘What is it that you see?’

Subjects on the other hand disallow a wh-phrase in [spec TP] (47a). Instead, two ex-
situ strategies are available: one that involves a cleft in a way parallel to the object
wh-question, as in (47b) and most crucially one that involves a post-verbal position
and the canonical subject position is filled by an expletive (47c).

(47) a. *Ubani u-fike?
    who1a S1a-arrived
    ‘Who arrived?’

b. Ng-ubani o-fikile
    Cop-who1a Rc1a-arrived
    ‘Who arrived?’

c. Ku-fike bani?
    Expl-arrived who1a
    ‘Who arrived?’

Example (47c) is parallel to the Aghem situation where the competition between the
focus feature and the EPP feature is resolved thanks to an expletive strategy: the
subject raises to the low focus position, while an expletive merges in [spec TP], and
nominative case is checked under Agree. Put together, the Kwa and Bantu facts
strongly suggest that the so-called in-situ position for object focusing or object wh-
questions actually involves the low focus position, but such sentences are blurred by the
fact that the resulting sequence resembles that of neutral sentences. An important
conclusion that we reach here is that the freezing nature of both [spec FocP] and [spec
TP] creates the subject versus object asymmetry found in both Kwa and Bantu.

3.2 Verb focusing in Bantu and Kwa
Another fact that I would like to mention without discussing in great detail is that the
focus positions identified here correlate with data from Kwa and Bantu on predicate
focus with doubling. In Gungbe (Kwa) and Tuki (Bantu), for instance, predicate
focus with doubling displays the pattern in (48a-b), which is schematized in (48c). It
appears here that these two languages resort to the higher focus position for verbal
focus.

---

6 These are traditionally referred to as predicate cleft, but see Aboh (2006b) for arguments against
this terminology.
In contrast, Nweh displays the pattern in (49a) and schematized in (49b). As the reader may notice here, Nweh realizes to the right what Gungbe and Tuki express to the left. As a consequence, while the focused verb occurs sentence-initially in these languages, it surfaces sentence-finally in Nweh.

If we treat leftward and rightward focusing in parallel, it is clear from the Nweh example that the position occupied by the focused verb (even in non-doubling cases, e.g. in Aghem) is structurally different from the position it normally sits in, when licensed for aspect. Given this, it seems to me that alternative analyses of focus in terms of right adjunction (e.g. Hyman & Polinsky 2006), or focus field (e.g. Good 2006) have nothing to offer as to why the focused verb occurs in a structurally different position and spells out twice in a mirror image of what we find generally in Kwa (and in some Bantu languages). That the distribution of the focused verb appears so symmetric and that verb focusing often relates to doubling phenomena across these languages suggest to me that there must be some deep structural reason for it.

Following Aboh (2003, 2004a, 2006b), Aboh & Dyakonova (2006), I therefore propose that verb focus in Gungbe and Tuki involves displacement of the focused verb (phrase) in sentence-initial position, while the doublet occurs IP-internally. Under this analysis, examples (48a) and (48b) can be represented as in (50a) and (50b), respectively.7

7 See Aboh (2006b) and Aboh & Dyakonova (2006) for analyses of verb focusing with doubling as instances of parallel chains.
With regard to the Nweh example (49), Nkemnji (1995) proposes that the focused verb moves into the head of a ‘low’ focus phrase, followed by raising of VP to [spec FocP], as in (51).

(51) 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{T}\,^\circ \\
\text{FocP} \\
\text{spec} \\
\text{Foc}\,' \\
\text{Foc}\,^\circ \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V}' \\
\text{ačūū akendŋ} \\
\end{array}
\]

Needless to say Nkemnji’s (1995) work is perfectly compatible with the view adopted here.

4. Conclusion
This paper shows that a comparison between Kwa and Bantu based on information packaging sheds some light on how information structure maps onto clause structure. It appears from the discussion that Bantu and Kwa languages provide strong empirical evidence for the existence of two focus fields inside the clause structure: one in the left periphery and one in the VP area. Following the cartographic approach that focus and topic features are properties of functional heads that compose the clausal left periphery (Rizzi 1997), and assuming that there is an edge to the VP that is similar to the clausal left periphery (Belletti 2002), this amounts to saying that there are topic and focus projections both within the clausal left periphery and the VP periphery. The proposed analysis indicates that certain contrasts between Kwa and Bantu (e.g. post-verbal subject, predicate cleft, expletive constructions) reduce to whether the lower or higher focus phrases, or both are activated.
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